

**REMARKS**

Claims 9-11, 13, 14, 16-20 and 22 are pending. In the non-final Office Action mailed on November 11, 2005, the Examiner rejected claims 9-11, 13, 14, 16-20 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over a Microsoft PowerPoint presentation dated March 10, 1999, and titled "Selling an Idea for a Product" ("MPP2000"), in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,938,032 to Heath et al. ("Heath") and U.S. Patent No. 6,421,733 to Tso et al. ("Tso"). Applicants herein amend claim 17. Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections. Further examination and review in view of the amendments and remarks below are respectfully requested.

Applicants' techniques are directed to using presentation templates to automatically generate presentations directed toward presentation targets (e.g., the person to which the presentation is to be shown). Some of the techniques utilize presentation templates that include component definitions, which include information bookmarks. Although the component definitions are included in the presentation templates, each of the component definitions are associated with a query condition that determines whether the component definition is to be included in a presentation. The information bookmarks are mapped to items of data relating to the presentation target. For example, when a presentation is generated for a presentation target, the query conditions are checked to determine whether to include the component definition in the presentation, and for the component definitions to include in the presentation, the information bookmarks in the template are automatically replaced by their respective items of data.

All of the claims recite (1) associating a query condition with each component definition, where the query condition determines whether the component definition is to be included in a slide presentation, and (2) determining whether to include each of the plurality of component definitions in the slide presentation based on its associated query condition. In rejecting the claims, the Examiner indicated that Heath's searching of single-slide presentation files (col. 2, lines 14-16; col. 4, lines 3-9 and 17-20) corresponds to

Applicants' associating a query condition with each component definition, where the query condition determines whether the component definition is to be included in a slide presentation, and determining whether to include each of the plurality of component definitions in the slide presentation based on its associated query condition. The Examiner further stated in the Response to Arguments section of the present Office Action that:

Specifically, the Heath et al reference has been relied upon to teach a [*sic*] associating a query condition with component definitions and utilizing those query conditions to determine whether or not to include the component definitions in a final slide presentation. (present Office Action, p. 6.)

Applicants respectfully disagree. Heath does not disclose, suggest or teach associating a query condition with each component definition, where the query condition determines whether the component definition is to be included in a slide presentation, nor does Heath disclose, suggest or teach determining whether to include each of the plurality of component definitions in the slide presentation based on its associated query condition. Heath merely describes a method for searching and viewing presentations at the granularity of a single slide in order to build new presentations from published (i.e., pre-existing) presentations. (col. 2, lines 1-4.) According to Heath, presentations are broken into multiple single slide presentation files (col. 1, lines 32-34), and the individual slides are searched (col. 4, lines 3-9) to retrieve a group of slides from several different presentations (col. 4, lines 17-19). The individual slides may be searched from a predetermined topic list or by keywords. (col. 4, lines 3-5.) The user can then include one or more of the retrieved slides (i.e., the slides which were retrieved as a result of performing the search) into a new presentation by using the "Select" button. (col. 4, lines 19-20, and illustrated in Fig. 3.) In Heath, the search is of the individual slides in the database of published presentations, and the search returns a group of slides from which a user may subsequently view and select for inclusion in a new presentation. Accordingly, a search according to Heath is not associated with a specific individual slide in that the search is performed across all of the individual slides in the database, and the search identifies a group of slides which may be used in creating a new presentation. Moreover, Heath's search does not determine

whether a specific individual slide is to be included in the new presentation in that the user has to make the final decision (i.e., command) to include the individual slide in the new presentation by using the "Select" button. In contrast, a query condition is associated with each component definition, where the query condition determines whether the component definition is to be included in a slide presentation, and the query condition that is associated with each component definition determines whether to include that component definition in the slide presentation. Applicants can find in Heath or any of the cited references no such disclosure or suggestion.

### **Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 9-11, 13, 14, 16-20 and 22 are allowable and ask that this application be passed to allowance. If the Examiner has any questions or believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned at (206) 359-8000.

Dated: 1/26/06

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Do Te Kim

Registration No.: 46,231

PERKINS COIE LLP

P.O. Box 1247

Seattle, Washington 98111-1247

(206) 359-8000

(206) 359-7198 (Fax)

Attorneys for Applicant